



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,982	01/13/2004	Ali Saffari	IGT1P208F/P000888-004	2263
79646	7590	05/20/2011		
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP - IGT				
Attn: IGT			EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 70250			HALL, ARTHUR O	
Oakland, CA 94612-0250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3718	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/20/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/755,982	SAFFARI ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
ARTHUR O. HALL	3718	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) ARTHUR O. HALL.

(3) _____.

(2) Nish Patel.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 May 2011

Time: 5:30 pm

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

1, 10, 33

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/ARTHUR O. HALL/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3718

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner stated that claim 1 included a formality that was missed, which was an oversight when reviewing the claims. The formality is that the second subtracting step and the adding step of claim each recite "a minimum wager amount," which should have been recited as "the minimum wager amount" since the comparing step recites "a minimum wager amount." This was clearly an oversight since claims 10 and 33 either originally recited the minimum wager amount without this informality or was subsequently recited as discussed to resolve this informality and provide proper antecedent basis. Examiner and applicants agree that the informality resulting from an antecedent basis problem does not cause a clarity issue since it is understood from the specification that there are not different minimum wager amounts.